

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-46 are currently pending. By this Reply, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 8, 27-29, 30 and 33, and has cancelled claims 3, 4 and 35-36. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter was added by these amendments and that such amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 5-34 and 37-46 are currently at issue.

The Examiner has indicated the Information Disclosure Statement filed January 26, 2007 was not considered because it failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) which requires a legible copy of each foreign patent document, and each non-patent literature publication. Applicant will investigate as to whether such legible copies exist and are in Applicant's possession, and if so, resubmit the Information Disclosure Statement.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because features of claims 35 and 36 do not appear in claims 35 and 36. Applicant, by this Reply, has cancelled claims 35 and 36. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits this objection is now moot.

The Examiner has objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter of claims 35 and 36. Applicant notes claims 35 and 36 were originally filed with the application and are thus part of the original disclosure. Notwithstanding this, Applicant, by this Reply, has cancelled claims 35 and 36. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits this objection is now moot.

The Examiner has rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicant, by this Reply, has cancelled claim 36. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits this rejection is now moot.

The Examiner has rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. 112

26 provides proper antecedent basis for the limitations in claims 27-29, and that this rejection is now moot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Itkis. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 30, as amended herein, is directed to a method for allowing a player to bet on and play a plurality of games. Among other limitations, the method of claim 30 requires “providing the player a prize based on the outcome of at least two of the plurality of games played.”

As noted by the Examiner, none of the cited art link a prize winning event being dependent on the outcome of multiple game sources. (Office Action of March 27, 2007, p. 16). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 30 is now in condition for allowance.

Claim 31 depends on claim 30 and includes each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 31 is also in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8-11, 16-22, 24-27, 29-38 and 43-46 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Karmarkar. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 8, as amended herein, is directed to a device including a player interface that allows a player to bet on and play a plurality of games. Among other limitations, claim 8 requires “the player interface further being adapted to provide a jackpot to the player based on the outcome of the plurality of games.”

As noted by the Examiner (and set forth above), none of the cited art link a prize winning event being dependent on the outcome of multiple game sources. (Office Action of March 27, 200

2007, p. 16). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 20 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 21-22, 24-27 and 29 depend on claim 20 and includes each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 21-22, 24-27 and 29 are also in condition for allowance.

As set forth above, claim 30 has been amended to require ““providing the player a prize based on the outcome of at least two of the plurality of games played.” For the same reasons given above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 30 is also patentable over Karmarkar and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 31-32 depend on claim 30 and includes each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 31-32 are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 33, as amended herein, is directed to a device that allows for playing a plurality of games at a single time. Among other limitations, claim 33 requires “a means for interfacing the plurality of games to be playable at a single time and to provide a prize based on the outcome of at least two of the plurality of games.”

As noted by the Examiner (and set forth above), none of the cited art link a prize winning event being dependent on the outcome of multiple game sources. (Office Action of March 27, 2007, p. 16). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 33 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 34-38 and 43-46 depend on claim 33 and includes each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 34-38 and 43-46 are also in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-

Claims 2 and 6-7 depend on claim 1 and includes each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 2 and 6-7 are also in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 12-13, 15, 39-40 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Karmarkar or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Karmarkar in view of either Adams, Lamle or Orentstein. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 8 is now in condition for allowance. Claims 12-13 and 15 depend on claim 8 and includes each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 12-13 and 15 are also in condition for allowance.

As set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 33 is now in condition for allowance. Claims 39-40 and 42 depend on claim 8 and includes each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 39-40 and 42 are also in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Karmarkar or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Karmarkar in view of either Adams or Lamle or Orenstein, or alternatively, over Karmarkar in view of either Vuong or Alden or Franchi as applied to claim 1, each further in view of Adams or Lamle or Orenstein. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 3 and 4. The Examiner has indicated that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent format. (Office Action of March 27, 2007, p. 16). Accordingly,

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 23 and 26 are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 14, 28 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karmarkar in view of Adams. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 8 is now in condition for allowance. Claim 14 depends on claim 8 and includes each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 14 is also in condition for allowance.


As set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 20 is now in condition for allowance. Claim 28 depends on claim 20 and includes each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 28 is also in condition for allowance.

As set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 33 is now in condition for allowance. Claim 41 depends on claim 33 and includes each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 41 is also in condition for allowance.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 2, 5-34 and 37-46. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if there are any questions regarding this Reply.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/26/07

By: <